



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Glóir do Dha an rna hárbuib, agur ríodcáin air an scalam deagtoil do na dáoinib.

LUKE II. 14.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. II.—No. 17.

MAY, 1853.

{ Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d.  
Payable in Advance

## CONTENTS.

	Page.
Bishop Jewell's Challenge, A D., 1560 . . . . .	49
Is the Protestant Bible a corrupt and mutilated version of the Holy Scriptures ? . . . . .	49
The Story of St. Epiphanius and the Veil . . . . .	50
On the constrained Celibacy of the Clergy—Dialogue II. . . . .	50
On the Old Irish Clergy—No. I. . . . .	51
Talk of the Road—No. XII. . . . .	53
Auricular Confession—Part II. . . . .	53
The Success of our Paper.—Controversy in a Christian spirit . . . . .	55
CORRESPONDENCE—	
On Purgatory, by Mr. E. Power . . . . .	56
On the Disputed Sacraments, in reply to J. B. . . . .	56
On the Sacrifice of the Mass, by A. C. T. . . . .	57
Authorized Statements on the Nature and Kind of Punishments in Purgatory . . . . .	58
Letter on Lady Day and Good Friday, by A. C. . . . .	58
Letter from Catholics, in reply to Fontium Pettitor . . . . .	58
Farming Operations for May . . . . .	60

## BISHOP JEWELL'S CHALLENGE.

THERE has been proclaimed to the world, now nearly for 300 years, and never yet taken up and responded to, by the party whom it concerns, this challenge, to which we solicit the serious attention of our Roman Catholic correspondents—

"If any learned man of our adversaries, or if all learned men that be alive, be able to bring any one sufficient sentence, out of any old Catholic Doctor, or Father, or General Council, or Holy Scriptures, or any one example in the Primitive Church, whereby it may clearly and plainly be proved, during the first six hundred years,

"1st, That there was at any time any private masses in the world: or,

"2ndly, That there was any communion then administered unto the people under one kind: or,

"3rdly, That the people had their common prayer in a strange tongue that the people understood not: or,

"4thly, That the Bishop of Rome was then called an Universal Bishop, or Head of the Universal Church: or,

"5thly, That the people were then taught to believe that Christ's body is really, substantially, corporally, carnally, or naturally in the sacrament: or,

"6thly, That his body is, or may be, in a thousand places at one time: or,

"7thly, That the priest did then hold up the sacrament over his head: or,

"8thly, That the people did then fall down and worship it with godly honour: or,

"9thly, That the sacrament was then, or ought now to be, hanged up under a canopy: or,

"10thly, That in the sacrament, after the words of consecration, there remaineth only the accidents and shows, without the substance, of bread and wine: or,

"11thly, That then the priest divided the sacrament into three parts, and afterwards himself received alone: or,

"12thly, That whosoever had said that the sacrament was a figure, a pledge, a token, or a remembrance of Christ's body, had therefore been adjudged for an heretic: or,

"13thly, That it was lawful then to have thirty, twenty, fifteen, ten, or five masses said in the same Church in one day: or,

"14thly, That images were then set up in the Churches, to the intent the people might worship them: or,

"15thly, That the lay people were then forbidden to read the Word of God in their own tongue: or,

"16thly, That it was lawful then for the priest to pronounce the words of consecration closely, or in private to himself: or,

"17thly, That the priest had then authority to offer Christ unto his Father: or,

"18thly, To receive the sacrament and to communicate for another: or,

"19thly, To apply the virtue of Christ's death and passion to any man by the means of the mass: or,

"20thly, That it was then thought a sound doctrine to teach the people, that mass 'ex opere operato' (that

is, for even that it is said and done) is able to remove any part of our sins: or,

"21stly, That any Christian man then called the sacrament his God: or,

"22ndly, That the people were then taught to believe that the body of Christ remaineth in the sacrament as long as the accidents of bread and wine remain there without corruption: or,

"23rdly, That a mouse, or any other worm or beast, may eat the body of Christ (for so some of our adversaries have said and taught): or,

"24thly, That when Christ said, 'Hoc est corpus meum,' the word 'hoc' pointed not to the bread, but to an 'individuum vagum,' as some of them say: or,

"25thly, That the accidents, or forms, or shows of bread and wine be the sacraments of Christ's body and blood, and not rather the very bread and wine itself: or,

"26thly, That the sacrament is a sign or token of the body of Christ, that lieth hidden underneath it: or,

"27thly, That ignorance is the mother and cause of true devotion:—Then, the conclusion is, I shall be content to yield and subscribe."—*Sermon preached by Bishop Jewell, on March 31, 1560 (being the second Sunday before Easter). Vide Jewell's Works, Parker Society Edition, vol. i., pp. 20-21.*

## IS THE PROTESTANT BIBLE A CORRUPT AND MUTILATED VERSION OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES?

THE authorized or Protestant translation of the Holy Bible into the English language, is often accused by Roman Catholics as being corrupt and false. We need hardly give many proofs of such a charge; and most of our readers will probably recollect the case of the monk who, about a year ago, was convicted at the Mayo Assizes, for having publicly burnt a Protestant Bible in that county.\* He said it was not God's Book, but the devil's book that he was burning. We should not have mentioned this case, but have treated it as the act of a fanatic, which all sober men would join in reprobating but that, after the monk was tried and convicted for the offence, the act was loudly applauded in the *Tablet* newspaper, which is the favoured organ of Dr. Cullen, Dr. M'Hale, Dr. Cantwell, and most of the Roman Catholic bishops. We shall not here repeat what we have already given at length in a former number, but shall merely say, that the *Tablet* praises the monk for what he did, saying, that it was indeed the book of the devil which Father John burned, and not God's Book.

Now, this does not very greatly concern the discussions carried on in the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, because, as our readers must have observed, the writers in this journal do generally quote Scripture from the Douay Bible. Still the question is one full of interest, and is deserving of careful examination, whether the Protestant Bible be indeed a mutilated and corrupt translation.

We propose to give this question a full and candid examination. The charge of "mutilation" is commonly founded on the authorized Bible not giving the *Apostolical* books as Scripture given by inspiration of God. We shall consider that question at an early period. We propose now to inquire whether the authorized translation of those books which both Churches admit to be inspired Scripture, be indeed a corrupt or a fair and honest translation.

We must consider briefly the history of the Bible in English.

When Saxon was the language spoken in England, there were translations of the Bible in the Saxon tongue, which were freely permitted to be read by the people. That was before the Church of Rome had taken up some of the doctrines she now holds, and before she claimed all the power she now claims.

There were several English translations made before the year 1407, one of which was by Wickliffe, a priest of the English Church. A council, held at Oxford in that year, forbade Wickliffe's translations to be read, but allowed of others sanctioned by the provincial councils.

At the time of the Reformation all these translations had disappeared from public use. The clergy had taken

no pains to keep up a supply of English Bibles, and no man could read a word of the Bible for himself, unless he knew Latin, except a very few, who still preserved some of the old copies in their families.

It was then the great object of all who wished to restore the purity of doctrine, and to weed out errors that had crept in, to produce an English translation of the Bible.

There were several editions of the Bible in English published by the Reformers, from the beginning of the Reformation to the year 1580—that is, in about 50 years.

The Roman Catholic translation of the New Testament only, was first published in the year 1582. The translators were Cardinal Allen, Dr. Gregory Martin, and others.

They say, in the preface, that they have the Old Testament lying by them for lack of means to publish the whole, so they publish only the New. This they did at the town of Rhemes, in Flanders, in the year above mentioned, 1582. The Old Testament, though then prepared, was not published until twenty years after. It was then published at Douay, from whence came the name of the Douay Bible. The New Testament was at first called the Rhemish Testament, from the town of Rhemes; but the translation was in fact all one, and when both Old and New were published together, the whole was called the Douay Bible.

The translators have told us, in the preface of that first Rhemish Testament, the reason of their making this translation—"Which translation we do not, for all that publish upon erroneous opinion of necessity, that the Holy Scripture should always be in our mother tongue . . . or that we generally and absolutely deemed it more convenient in itself, and more agreeable to God's Word and honour, or edification of the faithful, to have them turned into vulgar tongues, than to be kept and studied only in the ecclesiastical or learned languages. *Not for these, nor any such like causes, do we translate this Sacred Book; but upon special consideration of the present time, state, and condition of our country, unto which divers things are either necessary or profitable, or medicinal now, that otherwise, in the peace of the Church, were neither much requisite nor, perchance, wholly tolerable.*"

So it seems they thought it would have been better if they could have gone on without any English translation at all. If the Church could have been kept in peace (that is, without any searching of the Scriptures at all), then it would not have been "wholly tolerable" to have published even the Douay translation of the Bible.

But they go on to say that there is no way of meeting false translations of the Scriptures but by giving true ones, "which causeth the Holy Church not to forbid utterly any Catholic translation." So it seems that, only for the necessity of giving a true translation, in order to meet false ones, the Church of Rome might, perhaps, have "forbid utterly" a Catholic translation. They go on to speak with great approbation of "the order which was taken by the deputies of the late famous Council of Trent, and confirmed by supreme authority, that the Holy Scriptures, though truly and Catholically translated into vulgar tongues, yet may not be indifferently read of all men, nor of any other than such as have express licence thereunto of their lawful ordinaries or bishops." Although they lament that this rule, "in these days of ours, cannot be so precisely observed as in other times and places where there is more due respect of the Church's authority, rule, and discipline," they go on to praise the good old times, when Bibles were only "in libraries, monasteries, colleges, churches, in bishops, priests, and some other devout and principal laymen's houses and hands;" and, to show the great advantage of that state of things, they say—"The poor ploughman could then, in labouring the ground, sing the hymns and psalms, either in known or unknown languages, as they heard them in the Holy Church, though they could neither read, nor know the sense, meaning, and mysteries of the same."

They evidently thought it would have been a fine thing if the poor ploughmen could have gone on this way for ever, repeating holy words like parrots, without knowing what they meant; for they go on to say—"The wise will not here regard what some wilful

\* See 1st Vol. CATHOLIC LAYMAN, p. 41.

people do mutter, that the Scriptures are made for all men, and that it is of envy that the priests do keep the holy book from them. . . . No, no; the Church doth it to keep them from blind, ignorant presumption, and from that which the Apostle calleth knowledge, falsely so called; and not to debar them from the true knowledge of Christ."

It was not, therefore, from any desire that the people should be able to read God's Word that the Douay translation was made. It was simply because that was the only way to keep the people from reading the Protestant translations.

Of those translations, the Douay translators say, in this preface—"The Protestants . . . have so abused the people, and many other in the world not unwise, that by their false translations they have, instead of God's law and testament, and for Christ's written will and word, given their own wicked writing and phantasies;" and they also charge them with "adding whole sentences, proper to their sect, into their psalms in metre, even into the very creed in rhyme, all which the poor deceived people say and sing, as though they were God's own Word, being, indeed, through such sacrilegious treachery, made the devil's word." So the poor monk, who was found guilty a few months ago of burning the Authorized Version, as being "the devil's word," was not guilty of an invention of his own, but was only following the Douay translators.

It is true, the Douay translators did not speak in that preface of the present Authorized Version, which was not published, as it now is, until the year 1610. They spoke of the former Protestant translations made before the year 1580.

We shall state in our next number how far the present authorized translation agrees with, and differs from, those former Protestant translations; and we shall continue the history of the Douay translation, and the changes that have since been made in it.

In the meantime, we ask our Roman Catholic readers, who are in the habit of referring to the Douay Bible, when reading our discussions, to observe this fact, that if it had not been for the Protestant translations, they would never have had the Douay translation of the Bible into English—they would never have been able to read a word of the Bible at all. It is clear that only for what is thus indecently called "the Devil's book," their Church would have been well content to leave them for ever without "God's Book." Thus the Protestant translations have done at least this much good, that they have been the means of getting for Roman Catholics the Douay translation of the Scriptures into their own tongue. This, at least, is a merit that should not be denied or forgotten, unless we will say, what we hope none of our readers will say, that it would have been better if the Douay translation itself had never been made, but that all who can speak English only should have been for ever debarred from reading the Word of God.

#### THE STORY OF ST. EPIPHANIUS AND THE VEIL.

Having had occasion, in another column, page 56, to quote the letter of St. Epiphanius to John of Jerusalem, we give here, according to our promise, an extract, which will explain some of the circumstances which gave rise to the letter. "I heard that some are murmuring against me, for the following reason:—When we were going together, to the holy place, which is called Bethel, that I might there hold a service with you, according to the ecclesiastical custom, and when I had come to the village called Anablatha, I saw, as I was passing by, a light burning there; so I asked what place it was, and, being told that it was a church, I entered in, to pray there; and I found there a veil, hanging on the doors of the same church, dyed and painted, and having the likeness of Christ, I believe, or of some saint or other, for I don't exactly remember whose likeness it was. So, when I saw this—the likeness of a man hanging in the church of Christ, contrary to the authority of the Scriptures—I tore it, and I gave directions to the keepers of the place, to roll up some poor dead person in it, and bury him in it. But they murmured against me, and said, 'If you wished to tear our veil, it would be only right that you should give us another in exchange for it.' So, when I heard this, I acknowledged that it was reasonable, and promised that I would give it, and would send one forthwith. Some delay, however, having taken place, because I was anxious to send a very good veil, instead of it, for I thought I ought to send one from Cyprus [his own diocese]; but now I send the best veil I could find, and I beg you will give directions, to the priests of that place, to take it from bearer, and will give orders that no veils of that kind, which are contrary to our religion, should henceforth be hung up in the church of Christ, for it becomes you to be more careful to take away this cause of offence, which is unworthy of the church of Christ, and of the people who have been committed to you."

We have thought this story worth translating because of the important light which it throws on the practice of the Church towards the end of the fourth century. We have here St. Epiphanius, one of the leading bishops of the time, going into a church, and seeing there an innocent picture of Christ, or of a saint

hanging up. It does not appear that any adoration was being offered to the picture, or that any other abuse was connected with it—the picture was there, that was all. St. Epiphanius does not examine whose picture it was; he considers it contrary to the authority of Scripture to have a picture there at all; he tears it, and orders a dead person to be buried in it. Well, then, the attendants of the church murmur at him. No doubt they do, one might say. No doubt, they say—"You sacrilegious wretch, who have dared to tear this holy picture, do you think we will be partakers in your vile impiety, or that we will employ the likeness of this blessed saint in the mean use you tell us to apply it to." Not so; the attendants of the church say no such thing. They merely say—"Will not your reverence pay us the price of the canvas you have spoiled."

Further, St. Epiphanius has so little notion that he has done anything wrong, that he sends a full account of his performances to a bishop who was not on the best possible terms with him, whom he was himself, in the very same letter, rating sharply for his too great leaning to the Origenist heretics, and who, one would think, would be glad of the opportunity of a counter-charge against Epiphanius. And yet no such charge is made, and St. Epiphanius is not accused of the least irreverence in his conduct, which a present of a new veil amply atones for.

Finally, St. Jerome gets a copy of St. Epiphanius's letter, and in place of discreetly concealing the impiety of his friend, he makes a Latin translation of the letter, and hands down this anecdote of St. Epiphanius to perpetual memory.

Verily, the Catholic Church, at the end of the fourth century, had very different usages from the Church calling itself exclusively Catholic in our day. If St. Epiphanius could now be introduced into a Protestant church and a Roman Catholic chapel, the latter ornamented with handsome paintings of Christ and the Virgin, and, perhaps, other saints—and that not merely for historical use, but bowed down to by the people—which do you think St. Epiphanius would take for the old Church?

#### DIALOGUE ON THE CONSTRAINED CELIBACY IN THE CHURCH OF ROME.

NO. II.

*Eustachio*—The saints of the ancient Church praised virginity and continency to the skies, and were not satisfied with words only. How many holy bishops were there, in fact, who, abstaining from marriage, lived holily in celibacy?

*Salviano*—Let all due praise be given, then, to virginity. Continency is a great virtue. Tertullian calls it the flower of customs, an honour to the body, the ornament of the sexes, the foundation of holiness, &c. And Cyprian calls chastity the ornament of the noble, the exaltation of the humble, the comfort of the sad, the embellishment of the deformed. Be it so, then; it is true that these holy bishops did not marry, but it is no less true that they did not speak ill of marriage, nor condemn those who were married. On the contrary, the great Bishop of Hippo (St. Augustine) confutes the error of St. Jerome, who had allowed reproachful words to escape him concerning a state ordained by God. And Augustine selects this opportunity to show, in various ways, the utility of marriage. You say that there were many bishops who lived holily in celibacy, and we answer you that we can count up many who lived laudably in matrimony. Spiridon was father of St. Basil, and father-in-law of St. Gregory Nazianzen. In the family of Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, the bishopric was preserved, and had descended from father to son for eight turns, as Polycrates himself says, in writing to Victor, Bishop of Rome—"Seven of my ancestors were bishops in succession: I am the eighth." What shall we say, too, of Cherenon, Bishop of Egypt, who, with his aged wife and with many others of the faithful, was driven into exile and died in a mountain of Arabia? Clement, of Alexandria, exclaims concerning this—"Such was the marriage of the blessed." Hilary, a bishop most celebrated for learning and for holiness, had a wife and children, of whom it is written that his family was no damage to him, nor was his wife, who was united to him in lawful marriage, any hindrance to his ministry. Notwithstanding these examples, if a priest or a friar takes a wife, you look upon him as profane, you load him with abuse as the vilest man in the world. It was not so, however, my friend, in the primitive times of the Church of Jesus Christ. I have named to you many persons distinguished for holiness and for doctrine, who lived in lawful marriage. Now, we cannot find anywhere that those who lived in celibacy condemned or defamed those holy persons as you do in these days. But not only were the saints whom I have named hitherto married, but many of your popes themselves were sons of priests and begotten in lawful matrimony. We may instance, amongst many others—Boniface the First, Felix the Third, Agapetus the First, Adrian the Second, Agapetus the Second. Gratian, Platina and others bear witness to this. In fine, are there not many councils who make mention of the wives and children of bishops?

*Eustachio*—True, indeed; but there are, on the other

hand, many other councils in which the contrary was ordained.

*Salviano*—You cannot bring forward even one, especially of the four universal and truly catholic councils. The devil, as the enemy of the Divine ordinances, did not fail, it is true, to suggest to many the prohibition of holy matrimony, in order that he might introduce into the Church of Jesus Christ fornications and adulteries. There rose up some in the first Council of Nice who were of opinion that marriage should be forbidden to the clergy; but St. Paphnutius advised the very opposite. Hear what Socrates says on this subject—"Some bishops wished to introduce a new law into the Church, by imposing it upon bishops, priests, and deacons not to live with the wives whom they had taken when they were laymen. Paphnutius, rising up among them, cried out, that 'such a heavy yoke should not be put upon the most holy men, since marriage was honourable in all,' &c. Socrates says that Paphnutius considered chastity to be living with a lawful wife. All the assembly consented to his opinion, and silence was imposed about the controversy, each man being left at liberty to abstain or not from living with his own wife. You may read to this effect Sozomen, Gelasius, Cyzicenus, Nicephorus, Cassiodorus, and others. In the fifth of the Apostolic Canons, these remarkable words are to be found—"A bishop, priest, or deacon shall not put away his wife under pretence of religion. If he sends her away, let him be separated from the communion; and if he perseveres, let him be deposed." Whether these canons be those of the Apostles or not, let those declare who boast of them. The Council of Gangra excommunicates those who condemn married priests, and in the fourth canon expresses itself as follows—"If any one thinks that a married priest cannot, because of his marriage, exercise his ministry, and abstains on this account from communion with him, let him be anathema." Moreover, the Trullan Council, A.D. 692, ordained (contrary to the Church of Rome) that whoever, in spite of the Apostolic Canons, should dare to prohibit commerce or living with a lawful wife, should be excommunicated; and this canon is expressed as well with regard to the clergy as to secular persons.

*Eustachio*—If the councils just now named by you grant marriage to ecclesiastics, there are, however, many others which are of our opinion, and forbid the clergy to marry and to have children. We may say, then, as it is commonly said—here is altar against altar, council against council: on which are we to pin our faith?

*Salviano*—You cannot err if you follow the Word of God and the practice of the saints of the Old and New Testaments. Who can ever take away from you that which God granted to the patriarchs, the prophets, the apostles, and the disciples? Follow the rule of those councils which follow the Word of God. St. Jerome, in his commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, says—"The doctrine of the Holy Spirit is that which is declared in the canonical books, against which, if councils ordain anything, it is altogether wicked." But let us have recourse to your own practice. Since there is to be found in some acts of the councils a discordant opinion, we should hold to the sentence of that council the authority of which is the best founded and the most ancient. Do you wish to know, for instance, if images ought to be venerated? If you look to the councils you will find yourself somewhat puzzled—in fact, the Council of Elvira ordains that there should not be pictures in the Church. The Councils of Constantinople ordain the same thing, and the Council of Frankfort desires that images should not be venerated. But then, on the other hand, the second Council of Nice, the Roman and the Trent Councils, desire that images should be venerated. Well, then, it is very easy to know which of these councils have ordained the truth. He who is sincere will follow the first, since they follow in their decrees the Word of God and the practice of the ancient Church. He will do this the rather since, with regard to the matter about which we are in controversy, the councils adopted by your party, in favour of the celibacy of the clergy, are not in general opposed to those adopted by us nor are they in your favour.

*Eustachio*—What then? Is not the Council of Elvira on our side, which forbids, in one of its canons, the very same thing which our popes now prohibit? Here it is word, for word—"It pleases us altogether to command bishops, priests, deacons, and subdeacons to abstain from their wives and not to beget children." Can anything be clearer?

*Salviano*—No, dear friend; this canon is not at all in your favour, if you only quote the whole of it, as it stands in the volumes of the councils—"to bishops, priests, deacons, and subdeacons, *positis in ministerio*, while they are exercising their ministry." Thence it is clear that it was enjoined by the fathers on the clergy to abstain from their wives only while they were ministering or preparing for sacred duties. This is the true sense of many canons which you think favourable to celibacy. But how, I pray you, can canons of this sort be in your favour? How in the world do these canons forbid marriage to the clergy whilst they actually suppose that they are married already, and only command them to abstain from all commerce with their wives whilst they are preparing for sacred offices? To command the clergy to abstain from their wives when